

Appln No. 09/693,219
Amdt. Dated August 04, 2004
Response to Office action of May 27, 2004

12

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims

The Examiner rejected claims 1-30. By this amendment claims 1-2, 8-11, 15, and 18-21 have been amended, and claims 3-5, and 14 have been cancelled. Therefore claims 1-2, 6-13, and 15-30 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 14-21, 27-28 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Tabata et al (US 6,537,324). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Tabata et al disclose a document management system that uses “paper hypertexts”--i.e., elements on a printed page that can be circled or otherwise marked to select objects or initiate commands in a corresponding computer system. (See col. 9, lines 8-41.) Tabata et al however do not disclose generating a printed copy of a document where the copy includes information derived from a previous printed version of the document. The present invention on the other hand enables scanning a document having new markings that are not part of an archived electronic version of the document, identifying the new markings, and then producing a copy of the document by combining data representing the new markings and the archived electronic version of the document. That process is very different from the teachings of Tabata et al. To clarify the distinctions over Tabata et al, some of the limitations of the dependent claims have been incorporated into the presently amended independent claims.

The Examiner rejected the limitations of dependent claim 5, concerning “the copy of the document including information derived from both said scanned digital image of the document and said stored data representing the content of the document,” by citing Tabata et al at col. 8, lines 15-50 and col. 10, lines 8-52. However those lines of Tabata et al do not disclose or suggest such a limitation. Col. 8, lines 15-50 disclose the content of a “medium form 201” that is a page including the “paper hypertexts” (Dicons). Col. 10, lines 8-52 disclose a process of linking position information concerning the Dicons and address information “for correlating the described position information to the correlated information files.” Thus those lines of Tabata et al do not concern printing a copy of a scanned document where the copy of the document includes information derived from both the scanned digital image of the document and stored data representing the content of the document.

The limitations of claim 5 have therefore been incorporated into independent method claims 1 and 2 and claims 3-5 have been cancelled. These limitations have also been added to the independent system claims 18 and 19. Further, the step of identifying differences between the digital image and the stored data has been added to the method claims 1 and 2.

Support for the present claim amendments is found, for example, in the specification as originally filed at page 22, line 28, to page 23, line 13, where the document is referred to as a “netpage” and the differences between the digital image and the stored data include “markings which are not part of the archived netpage”:

Appl. No. 09/693,219
Amdt. Dated August 04, 2004
Response to Office action of May 27, 2004

13

"In general then, provided that the copier is able to sense the identity of an input netpage, it is able to produce a pristine digital copy of the page, with or without the digital ink associated with the page, even if the physical netpage is severely degraded or damaged.

By default, markings on the surface of a netpage which are not made with a netpage pen, and which are thus not known to the netpage system, are not duplicated when a netpage is copied in this way. However, since the page is also physically scanned by the image sensor, the copier can detect the presence of markings which are not part of the archived netpage, and can then optionally duplicate those markings. In this case the copier is able to compute the difference between the scanned image and a rendered image of the archived page, and can thus reproduce these differences in the copy. However, this process may reproduce unwanted artifacts such as creases and dirt, if present. If the user has requested an ordinary (non-netpage) copy of the page and the page contains non-netpage input, then the copier can also produce if required a local copy of the page, ie. one produced directly from the scanned image rather than including information from the archived netpage page description."

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

The dependent claims 6, 11-13, 22-24, and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata et al in view of Dymetman et al (US 6,330,976). Further, dependent claims 25-26 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata et al in view of Barrett et al (US 5,880,727). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Applicants submit that these rejections are now moot in light of the above amendments to the independent claims. Neither Dymetman et al nor Barrett et al disclose or suggest generating a printed copy of a document where the copy includes information derived from a previous printed version of the document.

Appln No. 09/693,219
Amdt. Dated August 04, 2004
Response to Office action of May 27, 2004

14

Conclusion

The presently amended claims are now clearly distinguishable over the prior art of Tabata et al, Dymetman et al and Barrett et al cited by the Examiner. Therefore it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



PAUL LAPSTUN

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762